DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 390 172 EA 027 281

AUTHOR Malcolm, Heather; Byrne, Michel
TITLE Implementing 5-14 in Primary Schools. Interchange No. 36.
INSTITUTION Scottish Office Education Dept., Edinburgh. Research and Intelligence Unit.
REPORT NO ISSN-0969-613X
PUB DATE 95
NOTE 13p.; Interchange No. 35 (EA 027 280) outlines the design of the evaluation as a whole and summarizes all its findings. Interchange No. 37 (EA 027 282) has secondary school implementation as its focus.
AVAILABLE FROM SCRE, 15 St. John Street, Edinburgh EH8 8JR, Scotland, United Kingdom.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *British National Curriculum; *Curriculum Development; Educational Change; *Elementary Education; English Instruction; Foreign Countries; *Guidelines; Mathematics Instruction; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation
IDENTIFIERS *Scotland

ABSTRACT

Between 1991 and 1995, the Scottish Office Education and Industry Department funded a national evaluation of the implementation of the 5-14 Development Programme based on information gathered from both primary and secondary schools. This interchange is concerned with the primary school perspective alone. Data were gathered from a questionnaire of headteachers and staff at approximately 200 primary schools, and interviews with headteachers and staff at 25 primary schools. Headteachers reported that their satisfaction with the program improved as they developed confidence and a more realistic pace of development was established. Teachers' and headteachers' degree of satisfaction was affected by implementation management and perceived benefits. Headteachers reported that they valued the liaisons with secondary schools despite the increased workload and different priorities held by primary and secondary schools. Finally, headteachers reported that support they received for program implementation varied in its usefulness. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 390 172

THE SCOTTISH OFFICE
Education and Industry Department

INTERCHANGE

No 36

Implementing 5-14 in Primary Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Wake
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Research and Intelligence Unit

ISSN 0969-613X

EA 027 281

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Why *Interchange?*

Research cannot make the decisions for policy makers and others concerned with improving the quality of education in our schools and colleges. Nor can it by itself bring about change. However, it can create a better basis for decisions, by providing information and explanation about educational practice and by clarifying and challenging ideas and assumptions.

It is important that every opportunity should be taken to communicate research findings, both inside and outside The Scottish Office Education and Industry Department (SOEID). Moreover, if research is to have the greatest possible impact on policy and practice, the findings need to be presented in an accessible, interesting and attractive form to policy makers, teachers, lecturers, parents and employers.

Interchange aims to further improve the Research and Intelligence Unit's (RIU) dissemination of the findings of research funded by SOEID. We hope you will find that ***Interchange*** is long enough to give the flavour of the complexities, subtleties and limitations of a research study but concise enough to give a good feeling for the findings and in some cases to encourage you to obtain the full report.

*The **Interchange** symbol invites you to reflect and respond to an issue or question posed by the research. You may wish to raise awareness by responding to each **Interchange** before reading the adjacent section of text. Alternatively, you may prefer to read the text first then review each **Interchange** to construct a personal summary of the issues.*

Edited and produced for The Scottish Office Education and Industry Department by the RIU Dissemination Officer at The Scottish Council for Research in Education, November 1995.

Copyright © 1995, SOEID

Interchange **may be photocopied for use within your own institution.**

A limited number of additional copies can be obtained by writing to the RIU Dissemination Officer at: SCRE, 15 St John Street, Edinburgh EH8 8JR. File copies for electronic downloading will also be made available on the RIU World Wide Web Server, accessible through Internet and JANET (http://www.ed.ac.uk/~riu).

Implementing 5–14 in Primary Schools

Heather Malcolm and Michel Byrne

Scottish Council for Research in Education

Between 1991 and 1995, The Scottish Office Education and Industry Department funded a national evaluation of the implementation of the 5–14 Development Programme, based on information gathered from both primary and secondary schools. The ways in which the 5–14 Development Programme was implemented in the two sectors were inevitably different, mainly because of differences in the organisation of the curriculum and its delivery. Consequently there were variations in the extent to which the evaluation probed different aspects of the implementation. Because of this, the outcomes of the evaluation for primary and secondary schools have been separately reported.

This Interchange is concerned with the primary school perspective alone. Interchange number 37 has secondary school implementation as its focus. Both these reports are complemented by Interchange number 35, which outlines the design of the evaluation as a whole and summarises all its findings.

It is strongly recommended that senior promoted staff in both sectors read the two Interchanges on primary and secondary schools as well as number 35, the most general of the three.

Introduction

This Interchange concentrates on aspects of implementation likely to be of special interest to those with responsibility for managing 5–14 in schools. Its starting point is an overview of headteachers' views about the Development Programme as a whole. Then, in greater detail, it moves to a number of implementation issues: the process of school development planning, the relationship of school policies to 5–14, the use of staff, the support available in schools to implement the programme and liaison with secondary schools. The report closes with some comments on the extent to which primary school staff felt satisfied with their progress in implementing 5-14.

Over three years, detailed information was gathered in the course of interviews with headteachers and staff in 25 primary schools, confirmed and supplemented by responses from headteachers and staff in a national questionnaire sample of approximately 200 primary schools.

Headteachers' first reactions

At an early stage in the evaluation, in spite of reservations about the demands that 5–14 would place on staff, most of the headteachers interviewed were well disposed towards the programme and held expectations that 5–14 would both highlight good practice and provide a clear structure for primary school teaching. They felt that the programme stimulated reflection on current practice and that discussion about the primary school curriculum would lead to improvements in the way it linked with secondary school work.

School development planning

School development planning which took account of 5–14 was under way in most of the interview sample schools in early 1992, and the majority of headteachers whose development plans were already in place felt those plans had been helpful in pacing 5–14 implementation. Responses to the questionnaire which followed confirmed this picture, revealing that a focus on targets had helped avoid 'staff burnout' and calmed panic, the process of thinking about how 5–14 should be paced had given staff

ownership of the plan and that simply having the plan had given headteachers a sense of being in control. As one explained:

> *I feel more in control of implementation, having previously felt overwhelmed. If anyone wants something not in the plan, I can show them and ask what should be removed to make way for new initiatives.*

A small number of people complained that, in spite of their plans, outside agencies were pressurising them to take action in areas which they had not prioritised, but when headteachers did not think school development planning had helped, their usual feeling was that more time, and only that, was what they needed. Overall, however, school development planning seems to have been a successful process through which headteachers could focus on 5–14 and how its implementation should be paced.

School policies and 5–14

Interviewed in both 1992 and 1993, headteachers saw no likelihood that 5–14 guidelines would displace school policies. These were and would continue to be important, even when 5–14 was fully implemented, because they took account of individual and school differences, including school ethos, in a way that 5–14 did not and was not intended to do. School policies gave teachers ownership of school practice, could link curricular and non-curricular areas and, unlike 5–14 which was 'fixed in time', were dynamic.

Many schools were revising school policies, or creating new ones, to take account of 5-14.

The extent to which this potential was being fulfilled, however, was put in doubt by the confusion showed by teachers interviewed in spring 1992 about school policies and their own role in relation to them. Furthermore, some curricular policies were out of date, and not in line with 5–14; in early 1993 a fifth of the headteachers interviewed acknowledged this, while others indicated that further work was needed to make sure existing policies complemented 5–14 more closely. All the headteachers interviewed claimed that 5–14 was influencing them in drawing up policies.

Do the curriculum and teaching policies in your school complement 5-14? In what way? Do they reflect your own thinking?

Overall, the data gathered on the relationship between 5–14 and school policies suggest that headteachers saw them as complementing each other, and that the programme had stimulated schools to re-examine their policies, drawing them up afresh or modifying old ones.

Use of staff

Over two thirds of the headteachers surveyed in 1992 indicated they had allocated specific staff remits for implementing various aspects of 5–14. Interview data gathered early in the following year suggested that for most headteachers these remits were allocated within existing management structures, and that the people most likely to hold them would be depute headteachers or other senior staff.

A quarter of the headteachers interviewed in 1994 commented on the importance of having energetic and enthusiastic staff to help them implement 5–14. Non-teaching deputes were especially valued because they could spend time helping teachers in the classroom, but keen and supportive classroom teachers, willing to implement new ideas and search for effective ways to improve what they already did, were equally prized for their ability to lead by example. Many of the classroom teachers interviewed were members of working parties which had led to their involvement in activities such as drawing up policies for mathematics, reading and writing, auditing existing practice, moderating levels and attending courses which sometimes gave them an advisory responsibility with respect to their colleagues.

Many classroom teachers were active members of school and liaison group working parties.

Should classroom teachers have more or less involvement with activities of this kind? Why?

However not all headteachers implementing 5–14 experienced the advantages that helpful and co-operative staff could give. Equally, not all school staff experienced the same quality and continuity of leadership. Four schools illustrated that lack of cohesion at senior staff level and lack of staff goodwill could stand in the way of progress. In two of these, management problems had been brought about by the rapid turnover of headteachers. In another school the problems were caused by changes in staff which had given rise to delay and in the fourth school the headteacher found it hard to combat low staff morale fed by a particularly unenthusiastic teacher. Situations such as these call for management skills of a high order, and some headteachers judged themselves wanting in this respect. Furthermore, not all staff wanted involvement in decision-making. As one headteacher put it, 'They argue that they don't have the time to be involved in decision-making *and* teaching, and they would rather simply be told what to do.'

Support provided for 5–14

Early data revealed that support had varied considerably among headteachers, and that satisfaction was scant. By spring 1993, however, there were signs of greater appreciation. Over a fifth of the headteachers interviewed, all but one in the same Region, praised the in-service courses that had been mounted. Others spoke in appreciation of the materials produced by the Region. In contrast, however, criticisms of the in-service courses provided were implicit in comments that useful in-service had to be relevant to staff needs. One headteacher found advisers intimidating:

> *I would like somebody to come in and design and discuss forms, planning forms, and actually sit with us and help us do it, without being threatening. You know, a lot of them are threatening.*

A small number of headteachers working in different Education Authorities stressed that their Regions and advisers had been very supportive, but they blamed the Government for having expectations of schools without giving them the necessary help.

The research suggested that the support then available for 5-14 varied in its usefulness.

Do you agree that in-service and adviser support could be better matched to teachers' needs? How might support for 5-14 be improved generally?

Regionally produced materials which received especial acclaim included:

- teaching support materials for mathematics;
- mathematics and language planning sheets;
- a mathematics pupil profile sheet;
- packs on religious and moral education;
- regional curriculum guidelines on mathematics and language.

Some headteachers referred to commercially produced materials which were more helpful now they were more overtly geared to the language of 5–14. There were also appreciative comments about SCCC materials such as the *5–14 English Language Reading and Writing Exemplars* and some headteachers mentioned the helpfulness of SOEID documents, specifically *5–14: A Practical Guide*, the staff development pack *Assessment 5–14* and *Using Ethos Indicators in Primary School*.

Complaints about cuts in PAT time were less strident in 1994 than in 1993, though, as one headteacher made clear, non-teaching time continued to be essential for staff activities such as reorganising classrooms and reading up new materials.

Further help needed

The help headteachers most wanted was more time and more resources.

Do you agree with these comments about the kind of help that schools need to continue implementing 5-14? What would you add to the lists printed here, or take away? Where should this help come from?

Apart from more time, which almost all headteachers wanted, the most common desire was for resources, specifically

- more staff, both teaching (including specialist support) and administrative;
- materials for developing mathematics, language, environmental studies and technology;
- examples of planning and record sheets;
- help with the implications of the more recent 5–14 documents;
- a contact person who could give help, reassurance and advice;
- information about relevant, good quality published material.

Two headteachers, both from small schools, felt that Regions had a responsibility to put resources into place so that teachers would not need to subsidise 5–14 by buying equipment out of their own salaries:

> *They want you to do all those things, but you have to go out and buy your own tapes of different kinds of music to let the children hear, and so on ... I think what I'm really saying is, maybe the Region should be looking at their resources centre, and really resourcing it on 5–14. They should be resourcing music, they should be resourcing pictures, and that kind of thing.*

Some of the headteachers asked for more in-service, in particular on

- identifying levels;
- how to administer and mark national tests;
- environmental studies;
- expressive arts;

- new technology;
- talking and listening;
- drawing up school policies and putting them into practice.

Both headteachers and teachers made it clear that more personal contact with secondary school staff would be welcome.

Liaison with secondary schools

Liaison activities used

Primary schools liaised with secondary schools in many ways.

In your experience, what kind of liaison with secondary schools works best? Why does it work? How could it be improved?

In questionnaires sent out in autumn 1993, headteachers and teachers who were directly involved in liaison with secondary schools were asked to indicate, from a given list of activities, which they were using and how successful they thought the activity was. Schools were engaged in a wide range of liaison activities, most of which were considered to be working well. Pupils making visits to secondary schools and primary teachers having discussions with guidance and subject teachers were very common and very successful liaison activities. Pupils' work going to secondary schools and the use of secondary school material in primaries were thought less successful. 'Link' work, begun in P7 and completed in S1, was relatively unusual, though over 90% of the headteachers whose schools used it judged it to be successful.

Some headteachers drew attention to liaison activities which did not feature on the given list. One noted that secondary staff had successfully 'shadowed' primary teachers, writing on her questionnaire:

> *[Secondary teachers] have more time to undertake such liaison and those secondary teachers who have made the effort to see primary children in the class situation have reported the experience to be invaluable. They also commented with astonishment on the range and complexity of primary teaching!*

An interesting variant had primary teachers shadowing some of their former pupils at the secondary school, and some headteachers furnished examples of ways in which secondary schools shared facilities with primary schools.

The influence of 5–14 on liaison

A common problem in estimating the extent to which an innovation has influenced existing practice is that the innovation does not take place in a vacuum: at any time what happens will be affected by other things, and some of these may bring about changes which are in line with those of the innovation. The questionnaire data described above were collected well after the start of 5–14, but it would be unsafe to assume that the activities listed were a direct result of the 5–14 programme. Indeed, many are likely to have pre-dated its introduction. One strategy for liaison which undeniably owed its existence to 5–14 is, however, the 5–14 liaison group.

These groups bear various names in different localities: cluster group, local co-ordinating team, area group, liaison group, strategy management group and so on. Just under three quarters of the primary schools in the questionnaire sample worked with such a group, but the evaluation data suggested that while 5–14 liaison groups had considerable potential as a means of supporting and furthering implementation, effort was needed to recognise and smooth out the practical problems which arose when schools tried working so closely together. Most of the headteachers interviewed in the spring of 1994 reported improvements to liaison as a result of the 5-14 initiative, although headteacher opinion about the liaison groups specifically was almost evenly divided between those who felt they had been successful strategies for implementing 5–14 and those who felt they had not.

Improvements in liaison

Most headteachers thought that 5-14 was helping to break down barriers between primary and secondary schools.

Is 5-14 helping primary and secondary teachers to understand each other's contribution to pupils' learning? How would greater understanding help pupils?

Underlying perceptions of success had been a feeling that the groups had offered a structured opportunity for primary and secondary school staff to meet on a personal level, which had strengthened relationships between schools, and made it easier for staff to share ideas. Headteachers working in small, isolated schools considered this to be especially valuable. Many headteachers also remarked on the groups' effectiveness in breaking down secondary school ignorance about what happened in primary classrooms, as well as the other way round. Primary school staff now had contact with secondary school teachers at department or subject level as well as with guidance and learning support staff, and increasingly friendly relationships between schools had led to further contact and help. For example, one headteacher described the secondary school's willingness to help out by making its science laboratories and equipment available for P7 use. There was also a feeling that secondary schools were more conscious of the need for continuity between primary and secondary schools, a view which seemed to be borne out by some of the outcomes of liaison that were cited in interviews. These included the development of joint assessment and recording procedures, ideas for link work in mathematics and English language and the introduction of an improved transfer system. P7 teachers echoed headteachers' satisfaction, one telling us that the secondary school staff now regarded primary teachers 'much more as equals, not inferiors. They're seeing that we have skills and so respect us more.'

Obstacles to liaison

Many of the headteachers whose view of the liaison groups was lukewarm had found them unwieldy and ineffective, demanding 'lots of effort and meeting up for only a small amount of movement'. Finding time could be difficult, whether it was for reporting to colleagues on the work done in liaison groups or simply for agreeing a meeting time that suited everyone.

A major obstacle was finding common ground as groups of schools struggled to bring together different philosophies, priorities and paces of working with

5–14. Many of the headteachers interviewed believed that some of the secondary school departments were reluctant to take an active part in liaison, one pointing out that all the effort of liaison went from the primary school to the secondary. 'They do come occasionally and visit,' she said, 'but we're the ones that have to send work on, we're the ones that have to send all the reports up to them.' Some secondary schools continued to want a 'fresh start', and in spite of her experience with a liaison group that had worked well in most ways, one headteacher remarked on the problems which arose when primary and secondary school staff encountered each other's different ways of thinking:

> *We stumbled over where differentiation should come – we said differentiation should come in the presentation of the task, they said it should come in the acceptance of the outcome. That was a big one and it took a lot of sorting out ... Also, well, we don't think of 'a subject'. Learning support and language and assessment and all that, they all just flow together, whereas when you are talking to secondary people you are talking to departments.*

Many headteachers believed secondary school staff knew little about 5-14.

Is there anything more you can do to increase secondary school teachers' awareness of 5-14 or of what your school is achieving in 5-14?

Other headteachers felt that liaison difficulties were rooted in the secondary schools' ignorance of the 5–14 guidelines, although some recognised that secondary schools had other priorities which did not, as yet, include 5–14. On the other hand, there was also evidence that a secondary school's full involvement in the programme could also create problems, if the pace at which the primary schools wanted or were able to move was different.

While the above illustrations concern friction between primary and secondary schools, examples were also given of problems amongst primary schools within a liaison group. Because schools rarely worked to a shared school development plan, planning requirements in one school did not necessarily run parallel with those of the group. 'Although the associated school group is involved in implementation at various stages,' one headteacher explained, 'the main thrust [in my school] is the SDP which must take priority over what is developed, and the pace.'

Different priorities among primary schools in the same liaison group sometimes made it hard for them to work together.

Is it possible for a group of primary schools to work to a shared development plan? Would it be worthwhile? Why? What are the drawbacks of doing this?

All in all, 15 of the headteachers interviewed in spring 1994 felt that 5–14 had influenced their liaison with secondary schools for the better. Some were not sure that 5–14 had affected it at all, and for a very small group the difficulties of trying to work closely with other schools had been so great that their effects had been detrimental.

Satisfaction with progress

A substantial majority of the 157 headteachers taking part in the questionnaire survey of autumn 1993 felt satisfied with their school's progress in implementing 5–14 over that year. Interviews held the following spring suggested that two main factors underpinned that satisfaction. One of these was a belief that staff had built up a degree of confidence with 5–14, especially in mathematics and language, and as a result felt happier about the Development Programme. The other cause for satisfaction was the feeling of having achieved a more realistic pace of development.

However satisfied they were with progress, however, headteachers did not feel they could rest on their laurels, and there were comments that much work was still needed. For some headteachers, satisfaction was mixed with disappointment that progress had not been faster. Others whose frustration was clear usually traced the cause to staffing problems: inadequate staffing levels often meant that basic things were done at the expense of more interesting activities; staff had difficulty in translating planned changes into classroom practice; in some schools there was a general lack of enthusiasm for 5–14, which sometimes fuelled low staff morale and loss of confidence among good teachers. However, one headteacher blamed lack of progress on the Region's working party for language, which seemed to have no clear idea of what would help.

Most primary school staff felt satisfied with the pace at which they were implementing 5-14, but there was evidence of some dissatisfaction.

How satisfied are you with the pace of 5-14 implementation in your own school? What are your reasons for feeling this way?

When the classroom teachers interviewed were asked for their own feelings about progress, almost three quarters acknowledged some measure of satisfaction. The main reason for this, as the headteachers had suggested, was growing familiarity with 5–14, but a contributory factor was often appreciation of the school management team and the way it had organised implementation. Teachers particularly liked time being set aside for discussion, support on an individual as well as a collective level and a slower pace of implementation. About a fifth of the teachers interviewed, however, had no sense of satisfaction, mainly because they felt swamped by work. Some blamed senior management for implementation that was 'scrappy and hard to follow' and for poor use of staff development time, while one teacher complained that with a change in senior management team a valued source of guidance and support had been lost.

Ultimately, however, the degree of satisfaction people felt was likely to depend not only on how implementation was managed but also on the benefits that were thought likely to accrue from the 5–14 programme itself. In spring 1994 both headteachers and teachers were asked what benefits, if any, could be seen from 5–14. While many people could see none and others thought it too early to tell, roughly half the headteachers and half the teachers thought the Development Programme was already contributing improvements to children's learning. It was offering pupils a broader range of experiences, equipping them with life-enhancing skills and ensuring consistency and progress in their school careers.

The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of The Scottish Office Education and Industry Department who funded the study.

Related research reports

Evaluation of the implementation of 5-14: an overview

This report will be available from The Scottish Council for Research in Education, 15 St John Street, Edinburgh EH8 8JR.

Implementing the 5-14 development programme in primary schools

This report will be available from The Scottish Council for Research in Education (address above).

Implementing the 5-14 development programme in secondary schools

The data gathered over the four years of the evaluation of the implementation in secondary schools are collated in the following reports:

Impact on classroom practice in secondary schools	ISBN 1-872054-13-7
Management of the implementation in secondary schools	ISBN 1-872054-14-5
Assessment and national testing in secondary schools	ISBN 1-872054-15-3
Primary/secondary liaison: secondary schools' perspectives	ISBN 1-872054-16-1
The professional journey: A case study of implementation in a secondary school department	ISBN 1-872054-17-X

Copies of these reports can be obtained from the Department of Educational Research, Northern College, Hilton Place, Aberdeen AB9 1FA. Price £5 each. For further information, consult the Northern College World Wide Web server at http://www.norcol.ac.uk

5-14 and national testing

5-14 and the least and most able pupils (£6.00 incl p & p)
National testing 1991-92 (£4.00 incl p & p)

Available from Dr George Thomson, Department of Education, University of Edinburgh, 10 Buccleuch Place, Edinburgh EH8 9JT.

5-14 and reporting

Reporting 5-14

This report will be available from Quality in Education Centre, University of Strathclyde, Jordanhill Campus, Southbrae Drive, Glasgow G13 1PP.

The Interchange series

1. Homework Policy and Practice
2. School to Higher Education: Bridging the Gap
3. Teaching, Learning and Assessment in the National Certificate
4. Developing School Managers
5. Transition from School to Adulthood of Young People with Recorded Special Educational Needs
6. Discipline in Scottish Schools
7. Training the Trainers' Programmes: Effective Management and Monitoring
8. Introduction of the New Further Education College Council System
9. Young People's Experience of National Certificate Modules
10. Costs and Benefits of Adult Basic Education
11. Performance Indicators and Examination Results
12. An Evaluation of the Advanced Courses Development Programme
13. Staying the Course
14. A Study of Probationer Teachers
15. Making School Boards Work
16. Professional Development Through Research
17. Students' Views on SWAP
18. Specific Learning Difficulties: Policy, Practice and Provision
19. Foreign Languages in Primary Schools: the National Pilot Projects in Scotland
20. Towards More School Based Training?
21. Patterns of Attainment in Standard Grade Mathematics 3–6
22. Patterns of Attainment in Standard Grade English 3–6
23. Implementing 5–14: a Progress Report
24. Education–Business Links: Patterns of Partnership
25. Foreign Languages for Vocational Purposes in Further and Higher Education
26. School for Skills
27. Effective Support for Learning: Themes from the RAISE Project
28. Marketing Means Business
29. Adult Education: Participation, Guidance and Progression
30. Studies of Differentiation Practices in Primary and Secondary Schools
31. Health Education: What Do Young People Want To Know?
32. Social and Educational Services for Children Under Five
33. Issues in Teachers' Continuing Professional Development
34. Primary Teachers' Understanding of Concepts in Science and Technology
35. Putting 5-14 in Place: An Overview of the Methods and Findings of the Evaluation 1991-95
36. Implementing 5-14 in Primary Schools
37. Implementing 5-14 in Secondary Schools

Further information

If you have views on ***Interchange*** and/or wish to find out more about RIU's research programme, contact the Research and Intelligence Unit (RIU), The Scottish Office Education and Industry Department, Room 1-B, Victoria Quay, Edinburgh EH6 6QQ

Printed by GNP Booth Ltd, Glasgow